

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,223	02/23/2007	Willibrordus Augustinus Van Der Weide	B-6013PCT 623479-6	9848
36716 LADAS & PAI	7590 07/01/200 RRY	EXAMINER		
5670 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 2100 LOS ANGELES, CA 90036-5679			LANGEL, WAYNE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1793	•	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/01/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/580,223	VAN DER WEIDE, WILLIBRORDUS AUGUSTINUS		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Wayne Langel	1793		

Oπice Action Summary		710000111100					
omoc Action Cummary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Wayne Langel	1793					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. Extensions of time may be available under the provisors of 3° CPR 1.1 after SIX (6) MCNITHS from the mailing date of the communication. If the communication is a state of the communication of the commu	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim- rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE!	L. lely filed the mailing date of this of (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•				
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 M	ay 2009.						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the	merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1.3.4.7.8.10-13 and 15-22 is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) 1.3.4.7.8.10-13 and 15-22 is/are rejection	— · · · —						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents Certified copies of the priority documents Copies of the certified copies of the priority accuments application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicativity documents have been received in (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage				
Attachment(s)							
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Profeseron's Patent Proving Review (PTO-948)	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da						

 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date __

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____.

Application/Control Number: 10/580.223

Art Unit: 1793

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior at are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurtzman, Jr., for the reasons given in the last Office Action. Applicant's argument, that Kurtzman, Jr discloses contacting the dry cellulkosic material in a proportion of about 3-10 parts'liquid per part of cellulosic material, which ratio is entirely different from applicant's, is not convincing. The disclosure at col. 4, lines 9-12 in Kurtzman, Jr of a proportion of , liquid to cellulosic material of "approximately 10" would embrace values of 10.1 or 10.5, for example, which would be embraced by applicant's claims. Applicant's argument, that Kurtzman, Jr teaches a single fermentation step, whereas applicant claims two distinct fermentation steps, is not convincing. Kurtzman, Jr discloses at col. 4, lines 32-35 that the moistened material is held for a period of time sufficient to allow a substantial reduction of organisms detrimental to mushroom culture. It is submitted that such step would constitute a "fermentation" step, especially since Kurtzman, Jr refers to the "ferments straw" at col. 5, line 49. The straw would not have been "fermented" unless the straw-liquid mixture were subjected to a "fermentation" step.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Application/Control Number: 10/580,223

Art Unit: 1793

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 13 and 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kurtzman, Jr, for the reasons given in the last Office Action. Applicant's argument, that claims 13 and 15-22 depend from claim 1, is not convincing. Although claims 13 and 15-22 refer to claim 1, they do not require the limitations of claim 1, since claims 13 and 15-22 are product or method of use claims.

Claims 13 and 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Branconnier et al, for the reasons given in the last Office Action. Applicant's arguments as to the irrelevance of the method disclosed by Braconnier et al are not convincing, since applicant has not provided any reasons as to why the product and methods of use as recited in claims 13 and 15-22 would be any different from that disclosed by Branconnier et al.

Claims 13 and 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over GB 2,294,257 or UK 1,500,326 or Holt et al. It is noted that applicant has not responded to this ground of rejection.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Application/Control Number: 10/580,223

Art Unit: 1793

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wayne Langel whose telephone number is 571-272-1353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8 am - 3:30 pm Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/580,223 Page 5

Art Unit: 1793

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793

.

.

.